Do's

- Add penalty for abusive graduation waiver rate
- Absolute performance must be a substantial part
  - Kids, teachers, families need to know this
- Add reading – absolute and growth
- Add science
- Flexible to adapt to future assessments & school configurations
- Change growth model per law
- Change weights
- Ensure that the background of students (ex. Free/reduced) is taken into account
- Use a type of regression equation to predict performance and grade a school based upon the extent of which a school exceeds performance expectations
- Include median and standard deviations for all performance data and reports
- Use Indiana personnel from universities, schools, Chamber of Commerce etc,
- Develop and communicate a 3-10 vertical slide to signify on-grade level performance by grade level with adequate growth build into the sliding system
- Consider many factors that affect student achievement/accountability so taht the system is equitable for all
- Growth consideration for all students not just the top/bottom 25
- Sliding/adjustable scale for growth points rather than cut offs
- Consideration of student transience/length of time at the school
- Consider pros and cons due to variability of scores if adopting a sliding scale
- Consider the number of waivers given for required classes when determining graduation rates and college and career readiness scores
- Look at what the assessment is really testing
- Look at achievement or growth towards proficiency
- Could we develop a system that says if 90 of your students pass ISTEP+ or 90 of your students show growth towards proficiency, you are an A school
- Recognize the limitation of the assessment i.e. ISTEP doesn't measure growth
- Simplicity/transparency
- Focus on growth
- Fair/reasonable expectations for
- Remain focused on student performance
- Remain flexible to add subjects (SS or Science)
- Focus particularly on K-
- Time at school
- Rethink graduation subgroups
- Transparent – why did this school fail?
- Simple
- Bonus/penalty points

- Model after a state that is already doing this well
- Language level with regards to achievement
- Multiple measures
- Clear, understandable
- Reward significant growth even if the percentage passing isn't really high but moving in the right direction
- Have a plan for when standards change and the test becomes more rigorous
- responsibility for all kids
- Multiple data points
- Waiver considerations
- Equal weight for growth/improvement for HS and E/MS if separate systems
- Align DWS/DOE certifications
- Create a mechanism for different populations to have different measures (i.e. Damar)
- Keep multiple data points in the HS model
- Stakeholder info
- Public needs to know what it means
- Participation points
- An accountability programs that can include all schools
- Transfers to CCSS
- Looks at growth and achievement appropriate to school and child
- Parents and students assessments of the school/departments/grade level teachers/administrators effectiveness
- Larger focus on school/corporation grade on student growth (NWEA etc.)
- Align with Title I categories
- Multiple measures (ex. School improvement metrics)
- Growth assessment model
- Incorporate school performance awards
- One system for all schools
- towards growth,   towards achievement,   towards multiple measures

Don'ts

- Use school configurations
- Use pass/fail tests to compare growth
- Place such a heavy importance on a one day test
- Not a punitive model
- Don't subtract points
- Focus on one part of the test
- Try to account for all grade configurations or alternate populations
- 1 data point
- Moving targets
- Completely start over
- Forget what we have already done
- Waste too much time on pilot – one year at most
- Support SBOE making major changes to the plan
- Overcomplicate
- Forget that growth is to proficiency
- Forget high performers need to grow too
- Add factors that are non-outcome based
- Penalize high achieving schools that will have lower growth
- Don't make the system so complicated that no one can understand how to attain the goal
- Don't communicate conflicting messages to the public
- Consider additional subject matter/content beyond ELA and Math (because they are not receiving Title 1 funding across states and therefore are taught with varying levels of consistency)
- Differentiate available growth points depending on which percentile of students consider
- Categorize based on A-F grading scale to designate school performance
- Discard current model
- Have a differentiated system that it is built upon
- Compare disparate school populations relative to a grade but rather to the extent that the disparate schools exceed expectations
- No more reliance on CTB
- Do an on-line test without a system to guarantee that it will work
- Continue to design/implement a model that emphases punitive measures over positive measures
- Don't include ELL and Special Education students in the grades